

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney  
STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
ANGEL LOPEZ, AND  
ROCHLEM ERIC AQUINO YADAO  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00241-ADA-BAM

STIPULATION TO CONTINUE STATUS  
CONFERENCE; ORDER

DATE: March 22, 2023

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

This case is set for status conference on March 22, 2023. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further notice.” Further, pursuant to General Order 611, this Court’s declaration of judicial emergency under 18 U.S.C. § 3174, and the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council’s Order of April 16, 2020 continuing this Court’s judicial emergency, this Court has allowed district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after May 2, 2021.<sup>1</sup> This and previous General Orders, as well as the declarations of judicial emergency, were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

Although the General Orders and declarations of emergency address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision

---

<sup>1</sup> A judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” at the discretion of that judge “or upon the request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020).

“counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, 617, and 618 and the subsequent declaration of judicial emergency require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

The General Orders and declaration of judicial emergency exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4). The Government’s position is that although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

In light of the foregoing, this Court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>2</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date for the status conference.

---

<sup>2</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.

1 *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be  
2 “specifically limited in time”).

3 **STIPULATION**

4 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and  
5 through defendant’s counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

6 1. By this stipulation, the government and defendant now move to set the matter for jury  
7 trial on January 30, 2024, and to exclude time between March 22, 2023, and January 30, 2024, under  
8 Local Code T4.

9 2. The parties further request that the matter be set for a trial confirmation hearing on  
10 January 8, 2024.

11 3. The parties further request an additional status conference on this matter, for August 9,  
12 2023.

13 4. By this stipulation, the parties now move to continue the status conference until August 9,  
14 2023, and to exclude time between March 22, 2023, and January 30, 2024, under 18 U.S.C.  
15 § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4].

16 5. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

17 a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case  
18 includes reports, photographs, and audio files. All of this discovery has been either produced  
19 directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying. Additionally, a plea  
20 agreement has been provided or will be provided to defendants.

21 b) Counsel for defendant desires additional time to further review discovery, discuss  
22 potential resolution with her client and the government, and investigate and prepare for trial.

23 c) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested  
24 continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking  
25 into account the exercise of due diligence.

26 d) The government does not object to the continuance.

27 e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
28

Cal. March 18, 2020).

case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of March 22, 2023 to January 30, 2024, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the parties' request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.

g) The parties also agree that this continuance is necessary for several reasons, including but not limited to, the need to permit time for the parties to exchange supplemental discovery, engage in plea negotiations, and for the defense to continue its investigation and preparation, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i) and (iv).

6. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: March 15, 2023

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

/s/ STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN  
STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN  
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: March 15, 2023

/s/ JAMES R. HOMOLA  
JAMES R. HOMOLA  
Counsel for Defendant  
ANGEL LOPEZ

Dated: March 15, 2023

/s/ MELISSA BALOIAN  
MELISSA BALOIAN  
Counsel for Defendant  
ROCHLEM ERIC AQUINO  
YADAO

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference set for March 22, 2023, is vacated. A jury trial is set for **January 30, 2024, at 8:30 a.m. before District Judge Ana de Alba**. Estimated time of trial is **5 days**. A trial confirmation is set for **January 8, 2024, at 8:30 a.m. before District Judge Ana de Alba**. In addition, the Court sets a status conference on this matter, for **August 9, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. Time is excluded through trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **March 16, 2023**

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE